



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,905	05/21/1999	KENNETH J. SCHRODER		8463

7590 02/10/2005

RINES AND RINES
81 NORTH STATE STREET
CONCORD, NH 03301

EXAMINER

WILLETT, STEPHAN F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/316,905

Applicant(s)

SCHRODER ET AL.

Examiner

Stephan F Willett

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103[©] and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Holte-Rost et al. with Patent Number 6,101,327 in view of Drogichen et al. with Patent Number 5,931,938 and RFC 1269.

4. Regarding claim(s) 1 and 6, Holte-Rost teaches router nodes controlled by software, col. 5, lines 42-44 wherein input and output ports associated with a routing/server device are paths. Holte-Rost teaches upgrading software, col. 5, lines 54-57. Holte-Rost teaches continuing operation while updating software, col. 6 and 9, lines 62-66, 8-10, respectively. Holte-Rost teaches preparing software information, col. 7, lines 4-8. Holte-Rost teaches swapping software,

Art Unit: 2141

col. 7, lines 41-44. Holte-Rost teaches a swap without interruption, col. 10, lines 19-21 and 42-48. Holte-Rost teaches an imperceptible swap as “the smooth System Upgrade method applied on the resource server”, col. 10, lines 29-30 and this reads on a server used as a router in a network. Holte-Rost teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching updating in a multiple router paths. In that Holte-Rost operates to update network software, the artisan would have looked to the router network arts for details of implementing multiple software upgrades. In that art, Drogichen, a related network router, teaches “routers”, col. 7, lines 24-27 in order to provide effective multi-node routing. Drogichen specifically teaches “router has multiple paths”, col. 21, line 58. Multiple path routing is taught. Further, Drogichen suggests “a global data router”, col. 21, line 29 which will result from using multiple routers. The motivation to incorporate multiple router paths insures redundancy. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate multiple router paths as taught in Drogichen into the router upgrading software system described in the Holte-Rost patent because Holte-Rost operates with various upgrades and Drogichen suggests that optimization can be obtained with multiple router paths. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claim(s) are rejected.

5. Regarding claim(s) 2, 7, 12-16, Holte-Rost teaches software upgrades. Holte-Rost teaches the invention in the above claim(s) except for explicitly teaching using BGP, SNMP, MIBs, software backplane architectures, control and data methods interfaces, active router modules, CLI, SNMP and HTTP in routing. However, Official Notice is taken MPEP 2144.03 (a)) that BGP, SNMP, MIBs, software backplane architectures, control and data methods interfaces, active router modules, CLI, SNMP and HTTP in routing is well known in the art to

Art Unit: 2141

insure dynamic routing capabilities. RFC 1269 specifically teaches "SNMP MIB", page 1, lines 8. BGP, SNMP, MIBs, software backplane architectures, control and data methods interfaces, active router modules, CLI, SNMP and HTTP is taught. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the application's invention to use BGP, SNMP, MIBs, software backplane architectures, control and data methods interfaces, active router modules, CLI, SNMP and HTTP in routing to obtain the advantages of communicating with known protocols and hardware. Therefore, by the above rational, the above claim(s) are rejected.

6. Regarding claim(s) 3, 8, Holte-Rost teaches revisions and upgrades are part of the new software package, col. 6, lines 19-22. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

7. Regarding claim(s) 4, 9, Holte-Rost teaches new software install notification, col. 7, lines 46-49. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

8. Regarding claim(s) 3, 10, Holte-Rost teaches preparation for the software upgrade, col. 7, lines 21-22. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

9. Regarding claim(s) 11, 17, 20, Holte-Rost teaches IP Messaging and linking, col. 6, lines 23-27. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

10. Regarding claim(s) 18-19, 21-22, Holte-Rost teaches a task state interface and table, col. 9, lines 1-8 and 22-25. Thus, the above claim limitations are obvious in view of the combination.

Response to Amendment

11. The broad claim language used is interpreted on its face and based on this interpretation

the claims have been rejected.

12. The limited structure claimed, without more functional language, reads on the references provided. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

13. Applicant suggests "clearly and functionally to define over", Paper Filed 12/1/05, Page 6, line 22 one router. In an effort to further prosecution, further clarity is required related to the multiple paths as how they relate to the upgrade. In yesterdays networks, routers were set up so multiple paths were available. Thus, Applicant's arguments can not be held as persuasive regarding patentability.

Conclusion

1. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure is disclosed in the Notice of References Cited. A close review of the references is suggested. A close review of the Schweitz et al. reference with Patent Number 6,594,822, col. 2, lines 3-8 and Lin et al. with Patent Number 5,155,837 are suggested. The other references cited teach numerous other ways to perform upgrades in switches, thus a close review of them is suggested.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephan Willett whose telephone number is (571) 272-3890. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Friday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

3. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia, can be reached on (571) 272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2141

4. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Stephan Willett".

Stephan Willett

Patent Examiner

January 14, 2005